## NATIONAL ISSUES

A MONSTER MEETING AND A GRAND OVATION.

Ex-Senator Spooner Opens the Campaign in Milwaukee by a Magnificient Speech.

Colonel John C. Spooner opened the campaign in Milwaukee on Wednesday evening, September 14, at the West Side Purner Itali. The audience which greeted the distinguished candidate for governor. was one of the largest and most enthusi-astic ever seen in Aliwaukee. Hundreds who went to the hall hoping to hear the eloquent orator, were forced to leave, not ing able to gain admission on account of the vast throng.

The following are the remarks of Colonel Spooner on national issues :

MR. SPOONER'S SPEECH, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen In my short and not very eventful public life, you have made me well accustomed to warm and generous Milwaukee welcomes, but upon my word the one which you accord me to-night abashes me. I do not take it as a compliment to me, but I take it as a compliment to the Republican party, whose standard-bearer for the state I happen at this time to be; and for the party and for myself as its representative, I make graceful acknowledgment. I regret to come before you to-night in an evironment which has rendered it imposble for me to prepare in an orderly way what ought to be said to such an audience: but as I am to come again to Milwaukee before this campaign ends, I am told, I shall talk to you to-night in a quiet, fair way, if I can, upon issues which divide the parties in this campaign. I say I shall talk to you in a fair way, because long, long ago I ceased to talk either or issues or men in an unfair way. [Applause.] When Garfield was bespattered with mud. when in 1884 the mill of slander was set up on the grave of James G. Blaine's child [applause.] I vowed that whatever the future might have for me in the way of campaign service, personal politics I was forever done with. Great applause. I leave that to the tumble bugs of politics. (Laughter and applause.)

THE ISSUE WELL DEFINED.

To my mind this is a crisis in the history of this country, in the history of its people it is not the first, of course, and doubtless not the most important. It was a crisis when our fathers won its independence; it was a crisis when they ordained the Union and formed the constitution; it was a crisis when Andrew Jackson crushed dissention in South Carolina; it was a crisis hen under the leadership of Lincoln and Grant and Logan and Sherman and their compatriots, including Benjamin Harrison of Indiana (great applause), the Union was preserved, purified and made perpetual. To-day the conflict is no less bitter. The issue is no less marked, and the result, it seems to me, is of infinite importance to

The protective system of the United States is challenged by the Democratic party of the country to mortal combat. Under which flag? You must take sides; you must marshal under the flag of Washington, of Jefferson, of Adams, of Monroe, of Jackson of Lincoln and the long line of protection presidents, or you must take your place under the tree trade flag which now flung to the breeze, undisguised by the National Democratic party as it calls itself. [Applause.]

You cannot remember any great item of ward since 1860, tending to the upbuilding of our people, to the preservation of the Union, to the restoration of the state, to the maintenance of our credit, that has not been considered and denounced as unconstitutional by the Democratic party. [Applause. They thought, you remember, that it was unconstitutional to coerce a state. They were mistaken about that. They thought it was unconstitutional to issue greenbacks, they were mistaken about that. They thought it was unconstitutional to suspend the writ of habeas corpus : they were mistaken about that. thought it was unconstitutional for Abraham Lincoln. God bless his memory for ever great applause, to issue the emancipation proclamation. They were mistaken about that. |Great applause.| They thought the reconstruction acts were unconstitutional, and they were mistaken about that. They thought Tom Reed was unconstitutional, but they were mistaken about that. |Laughter and applause, | He has just been re-elected. They thought the sugar bounty was unconstitutional, and they were mistaken about that. They thought recriprocity was unconstitutional, and they were mistaken about that. (Applause.) They thought the gerrymander was constitutional, and they were mistaken about that. Great applause. | So I have sort of lost faith in the Democratic party as a constitutional

expounder. (Laughter and applause.)
I might if I had time, and you the patience, read what Thomas Jefferson said in favor of the protective system. Again, again, and again be declared it. in terms that come ringing down the years as the utterances of a man who was a patriot. The Democrats of to-day never weary of talking of their loy aity to Thomas Jeffer-son. As I rode along from the Plankinton house to this half I saw a banner and upon it was inscribed "Jefferson clab." the Democratic party on this question of protection is loyal to Jefferson, but it is oyalty to Jefferson Davis, not to Thomas Jefferson. [Applause.] A Voice—"That is right."

HAS VINDICATED ITSELF.

Now I dare say here to-night that if ever a piece of legislation enacted by the con-gress of the United States has vindicated itself, it is the McKinley law. [Applause.] ou were told in 1890 that it would check imports. You were told in 1890 that it raised the average duty to 60 per cent. You were told it raised the duty far above the average duty during the days and years of the war. You were told that it would check our export trade, for people would not buy of us if we didn't buy of them. All these statements were made in 1890 about the McKinley law. Let me give you only a little statistical information upon that subject as it comes to us to-day from

the Treasury department:
The balance of trade in our favor, that is, the amount of money other nations paid to us over and above what we part to them, was \$160,225,921 as against \$56,347,922 the previous year. The free imports that came in under this law were \$161,373,523; the dutiable imports, the taxed imports, to import the first state of all the importations into the United States this year as I said here in 18:0, for the duty on timportations into the United States this year as I said in 1890 I would do it again if plate. I said in 1890 I would do stiable imports, the taxed imports, \$375,-87-100 came in dutiable. Mr. Carusie esti-mated—and I have no doubt he was honest in it, for he is a fair man in debate, and a very able man—that the average of the property very able man-that the average duty sent away from the United States \$361, under the Mckinley law would be 60 per 000,000 for in plate. That takes not into cent; when the truth is, as demonstrated. that the average duty applied to the free and the dutiable list is only 20 and a fraction per cent. and the average duty applied only to the dutiable list is 45 per cent. [Applause.] Take either, and it is lower than any other tariff we have ever had in the United States, including the

Now it has turned out, because a non-partisan report of the United States Senate Committee on Finance shows it. (I cannot operation of this tariff law, the cost of living has diminished, and the price of wages has increased; only a little, but increased as shown by that report; while in free trade England the price of living has increased, and wages have decreased. You all heard Mr. Peck's report. [Applause.] I saw a statement in the Tribune mean the labor commissioner of the state table, snows forty estations, which I shall furnish to my Democratic free trade furnish to my Dem go into the de ails to-night), that under the

of New York, who was appointed to that office by Mr. Cleveland, and retained in it by Gov. Hill. He has lately made a report as labor commissioner of the state of New York, from which it appears that during the years since the Mckinley law went into effect there has been an increase in that single state of wages of \$6.000.000 and of the single state of wages of \$6.000.000 and of the single state of wages of \$6.000.000 and of the single state of wages of \$6.000.000 and of the single state of wages of \$6.000.000 and of the single state of wages of \$6.000.000 and of the single state of wages of \$6.000.000 and of the single state of wages of \$6.000.000 and of the single state of wages of \$6.000.000 and of the single state of wages of \$6.000.000 and of the single state of wages of \$6.000.000 and of the single state of wages of \$6.000.000 and of the single single state of the single s single state of wages of \$6,000,000, and of manufactured products \$31,000.000.

No wonder the average free trader says Peck is a liar. [Laughter.] That is one trouble with the free trader—I don't say, mind you, with the Democrat, but—with the man who is willing to reverse the policy under which we have prospered. The man who is willing to tear down the protective system and put this country upon the free trade basis. Nothing in the way of an industrial triumph pleases him. Nothing in the line of an industrial calamity but what gives him encouragement. [Applause.] They are the Anarchists of American industry; they are the Anarchists of American labor [applause], whether they mean to be or not. They stand always with wide open mouths shouting prophesics of evil. They frighten capital whenever they can against entering into this industry. they can against entering into this industry or that. They thereby keep labor out of employment, and they depress our country

and our prosperity.

They are everlastingly telling us: "You cannot do this and you cannot do that." want an American citizen never to say that American capital and American labor cannot do anything. They told us way back in 1867 and 1870: "You cannot make steel rails." At that time steel rails were selling at \$150 in gold, and very much more in currency. Congress put a duty on steel rails, and without going into the de-tails of it, to-day we are making in the United States, and have been for years, all the steel rails which we have needed for our domestic consumption, and we are exporting some, too [applause], and the price has come down, down, down, until it ranges from \$27 to \$31 and \$32 a ton. | Au-plause.] Well, when I made that statement the other day to a free trader, he said to me: "Well, if we have got so now that we can make steel rails and export them, why don't you take the duty off?" [Laughwhy don't you take the duty off? [Laughter.] And I said to him just what I say to you to-night that there would be just as much sense in my going to you and saying: "My friend, that fence of yours has kept your neighbor's hogs out of your cabbages

now for four years; why don't you take it down " [Great laughter and applause.]

SUGAR MADE CHEAP AND PARMERS PRO-TECTED. We passed the McKinley law: we took the duty off of sugar; we cheapened sugar to every family in the United Scates. A while after we took the duty off of sugar Mr. McKinley told me that a man in his town went into a store and wanted a gollar's worth of sugar, and the merchant began to weigh it out; he kept dipping, dipping, dipping the sugar into the measure, and the purchaser interrupted him and "I only want a dollar's worth." said: said: "I am giving you a dollar's worth:" and he kept on until he made a bundle of twenty pounds of sugar and wrapped it up. The man took it in his arms. walked out to the sidewalk, and said: "Mr. French, don't you tell my wife that I got that sugar for a dollar." "Why?" "Why, if you did she will never give me any peace till I vote the Republicanticket." [Greatapplause and laughter.] We were paying about \$55,000,-000 a year out of the pockets of the people. duty on sugar, and toat was a tax because that was a tariff for revenue only, for we did not produce enough sugar in this country to affect by competition the price of it here at home. Gen. Bragg talked the other night at Tomah about our legislating in favor of the sugar trust. We put a duty on raw sugar; sugar which could not be used by the people without being refined; we preferred that our sugar should be refined in the United States to having that reasonable duty upon it. But we did not begin to put the duty upon refined sugar that the Mills bill put upon it. The duty put by the Mills bill upon refined sugar saved to the sugar trust \$11,000,000 more a year than the duty put upon refined sugar by the McKinley law. We gave a bounty could to the duty we had taken off to en-courage home production and we afford thereby-and the supreme court held it to constitutional-we afford thereby the same encouragement at a small outlay to the domestic production as this great tariff did when levied upon sugar. And what is the result of it? We did it with our eyes open.

good as ever was seen on the earth. Gov. Rusk told me the other day that the experts had demonstrated beyond any question that there was a large belt of states having the soil and the climate which would enable the farmer to make a profitable crop of the sugar beet and which would enable us before many years to make, in his judgment, to provide our own people with sugar; and he told me that W-sconsin was one of those states; and the Oxford company has agreed with him to establish a great sugar referery in this state in order to give our farmers a chance to open up another agricultural industry.

We did it to encourage the production of

sugar in the South ; we did it to encourage

the beet sugar product in the North, and

one refinery in Neoraska this year, will produce 8,000,000 pounds of beet sugar as

SO WILL PEARL BUTTONS AND LINEN. Why, the free traders told us when the McKinley law was passed: "You cannot make pearl buttons." Well the trouble with that is, we are making pearl buttons. There is only one pearl button which we are not making in this country to-day. which we imported here before the McKinley law, and that is one made in the prisons of Austria which we prohibited from com-

ing here forever. [Applause.]
They told us that the duty on linen—the duties imposed in that schedule would enhance the price of linen to the people and would not do any good "because you can-not make linen in the United States." Why dot? We have the flax: "Oh, yes; but you have not the machinery." Well, when before did America fail to make any thing for lack of machinery? If they cannot buy it they invent it. [Continued applause.] It was not long after the McKinley law was enacted that they sent several bales of Minnesota flax to the mills in Scotland, and it came back in good linen, with a certificate that they had never had any better fiber in that mill: and the other day when we met in Minneapolis to nominate Benjamin Harrison the next president of the United States | great applause | the great Exposition building was carpetedyou remember it-with linen made out of Minnesota flax in a Minneapotis mill. [Great applause.] No, we cannot make Well, my free trade friend, we can linen. make linen, and we will make linen.

[Great applause.] MAKING TIN PLATE NOW. There is no one subject upon which more has been said against the McKinley account the duties paid upon it; and the duty was a tax because we made none. That does not take into account the freight, the insurance, or the profits of the middle-man. We thought we would try to make our own tin plate, and keep our money at home. We thought we had sent enough of report of Col. Ayer of the Treasury Department, which I have here upon the table, shows forty establishments to-day, and gives the names of them, which I shall

the other day that they had just imported one of those tin plate machines to Wales and were very greatly pleased with it. [Applause.]

WOOL. Wool.

We put wool on the dutiable list higher than it was before. Under the reduction of duty in 1883, the wool-growing industry of the United States began to decay, and in five years 11,000,000 sheep disappeared. In 1888 one-fourth of the woolen milis of the United States were idle and their operatives thrown out of employment. The Mc-Kinley law increased the duty on wool, made it adequately productive, and in a single year the sheep in the United States increased 1,500,000 and the wool product increased 9,000,000 pounds; not only that increased 9,000,000 pounds; not only that but the importation of woolen goods that year decreased \$14.000,000, with no decrease in the domestic production of woolen goods. We simply made them at home instead of sending money abroad to buy them from there [applause], and to-day, ladies and gentlemen, there is not a woolen mill in the United States that is not run-ning, and a large number have been added. Why, the Democratic party, as I recollect, it succeeded in 1890, in electing a con-

gress. They elected that congress on a platform that they would repeal the Mc-Kinley law, and how many majority did they have? One hundred and seventy-A tremendous majority in session, five. month after month, month after month, month after month-and what were they doing? Simply firing paper-wads at the McKinley law. [Laughter and applause.]
Why didn't they repeal it if it was such a
robbery? They passed a bill putting wool
on the free list. They say in their majority report that the duty on wool has not been of any benefit to the farmer; that it has not mereased the price of wool (that is a falsehood, but they say it) and the taking of duty off of wool would not decrease the price of wool to the farmer. In the next me they say they take the duty off of wool because it is a raw material and they want to cheapen the cost of woolens. If taking the duty off of wool would not diminish the price of wool now would it diminish the price of woolens? Two million men in the United States engaged in sheep raising this last year that produced 286,-000,000 pounds of wool. The value of the furmers' sheep in the United States to-day is \$117,000,000 and his income from wool last year was \$29,000.000, and yet this Democratic house repealed so much of the McKinley law as to put woo! on the free list-let it come in here without restriction the wool of Australia and South America. If I had the time I could show you that in Australia they have good grass all the year around except when they have an occasional drought. They get their lands from the crown and they pay only 2 cents an acre by the year and three acres to the sheep; so that it only cost them 6 cents for the sheep the whole year round. They have multiplied that industry and increased it so that it is as plain as anything can be that if the duty is taken off of wool, the sheep husbandry of the United States must be killed; but these men-taink of it a minute-these men take the duty off wool and yet they leave a duty by their bill of 39 per cent, on woolen cloths. They talk to us about class legislation—what is that class legislation? - discriminating against 2,000,000 men engaged in sheep husbandry and discriminating in favor of 220,000 men engaged in the manufacture of

woolen cloth. That is not all. We put a prohibitory duty on shoddy of 30 cents a pound and kept a high duty on rags and waste to keep that pest-laden stuff out of the United States, and to improve the quality of the clotning which our people wore. [Great appliause.] The bill which they reported from the committee and which passed the house, putting wool on the free list and leaving woolens 39 per cent. dutiable, the reason of that? It is that in this great made rags free and put shoddy at 2 cents a battle. Great Britain has deliberately pound. This great patriotic Democratic congress, dominated by the South largely, discriminated against the American farmer and in favor of the Paris rag picker, ask the farmer of Wisconsin to stand by them and vote for free wool and free trade all

along the line! Will you do it? A voice-"No, never." [Applause.]

BISMARCK'S TESTIMONIAL.

They have had a great deal to say about the farmer having no protection under the McKinley law. I cannot take the time to go into it to-night, but on tobacco the farmer's market last year was \$7,000,000 more than it was the year before, and we saved to the farmers of this country by the duties levied by the McKinley law upon their products in gross \$16,000,000 as against the year preceding the enactment of the tariff law. Now when the free trader talks about the tariff as robbery and undertakes to satisfy the people that it is class legislation and ought to be wiped away, he takes upon himself an awful big contract, It was Prince Bis marck, the great statesman of Germany whom our people remember as standing in his white uniform beside the old emperor when the ensign of united Germany was planted to stand forever—it was Prince Bismarck who said that he had watched the course of America. He had seen her wonderful progress and he ascribed it to her protective tariff system. I want to

"The success of the United States in material development is the most illustrious of modern times. The American nation has not only successfuly borne and suppressed the most gigantic and expensive war of all history, but immediately after-ward disbanded its army, found work for all its soldiers and bereaved, paid for almost all of its debts, gave labor and homes to all of the unemployed of Europe as fast as they could arrive within its territory; and has done all this by a system of taxation so indirect as not to be perceived, much less to be felt; because it is my deliberate judgment that the prosperity of America is mainly due to its system of protective laws, i urge that Germany has now reached that point where it is necessary to imitate the tariff system of the United States." And Germany thereapon adopted a protective tariff under which the industries of Germany have trebled and the wages of German labor have increased 33), per cent. [Great applause.] And that is the utterance of a statesman who stood away from us unbiased by our poli-tics without prejudice of section; but looking upon us from a distance with the eyes of a keen statesman and a philosopher; and that judgment of our prosperity and of our policy put in vogue among his own people. And when the tree trader arraigns protection as a system of robbery he impeaches the judgment and the integrity and the common sense of every people under the sun, except Great Britain. France has her protective tariff, Germany her protective tariff, Italy her protective tariff, Canada her protective tariff. Austria, Russia, all of them a protective tariff, and what awful foois they must all be in the free trader is right. [Applause.]

WHAT DEMOCRATIC SUCCESS MEANS.

Now, gentlemen, what is to become after the McKinley law is repealed? If you vote the Democratic ticket and adopt as your policy the platform at Chicago you must adopt a tariff system which has no element of protection in it. They adopt a tariff system which takes no account of our industries, which takes no account of our labor. Labor in England on the average is 77 per cent. lower than it is in America, and it is absolutely impossible that these gentlemen can adopt a tariff for our millions in gold to Wales, and we would try the business ourselves. Now, I cannot go into the details to night, but the a product at 50 cents less in cost than I do. you can sell me out of existence in a day. if the cause of my increased cost is labor. There is only one way known under the heavens by which I can reduce the cost of

right to experiment with what belongs to right to experiment with what belongs to you. Out upon the political party willing to experiment in legislation with the wages of our laboring men and with their well being and comfort and happiness. [Applause.] They tell us that wages in this country are higher than they are over there, but that everything else is cheaper over there than it is here, and that the lower wages paid over there have therefore greater purchasing power than they have over here. Well, now if that is true. have over here. Well, now, if that is true, a man must be better off over there; and if man is better off over there with his lower wages, and their greater purchasing power, what in the name of heaven do they want to come over here for? [Applause.] I can understand how they might be mislead into coming here by false reports, circulated by steamship agents and all that sort of thing, but when they get here and find that they are so much worse of than they are over there, why don't they go back again? [Applause.] But they do not; they come here because this is and has been under the American policy the land of promise for the honest laborers of the earth who care to come here and make this their home;

and we propose to keep it so. LORD SALISBURY SEES IT, TOO. You may see a fellow hit and think he is struck pretty hard, but he knows how hard he is hit better than you do. The hardest headed statesman in England is Lord Salisbury, and Lord Salisbury says on this question of reciprocity something

I would like to have you remember.
"After all, this little island lives as trading island. We could not produce, in food stuns, enough to sustain the population that lives in this island, and it is only by the great industries which exist here and wnich find markets in foreign coun tries that we are able to maintain the vast population by which this island is inhabited; but a danger is growing up. Forty or fifty years ago everybody beneved that tree trade had conquered the world, and they prophesized that every nation would follow the example of England and gave itself up to absolute tree trade. The resuits are not exactly what they prophe sized, but the more adverse the results were, the more the devoted prophets of free trade declared it would come out all right. The worse the tariffs of foreign countries became, the more confident were the prophesies of an early victory; but we see now." This is not a free trader from Wisconsin or Chicago testifying. It is Lord Salisbury, until recently the premier of Great Britain.

"We see now after many years' experience that explains it, how many foreign nations are raising one after another a The free list of t wall, a brazen wall of protection around their stores which excludes us from their markets, and as far as they are concerned do their best to kill our trade. And this state of things does not get better. On the contrary, it constantly seems to get worse. Now, of course, if I utter a word with reference to free trade I shall be accused of being a protectionist, of a desire to overthrow free trade and of all the other crimes which an ingenius imagination can attach to the commercial hetero doxy. If we look abroad into the world we see it. In the office which I have the nonor to hold I see a great deal of it. We live in an age of a war of tariffs. Every nation is trying how it can by agreement with its neighbors get the greatest possible proportion for its own industries and at the same time the greatest possible access to the markets of its neighbors. This kind of negotiation is continually going on, or has been going on, for the last year and a half with great activity. I want to point out to you what I observe is that while A is very anxious to get favors of C, nobody cares two straws about getting the commercial favors of Great Britain. stripped herself of the armour and the And thereupon he proposes that England shall use the weapons which the United States has been using, not against the United States, he says, because they must have in England our raw material and our food products. If there ever was a tribute which ought to add weight to the reciprocity scheme, and the tariff scheme

# BLAINE ON THE ISSUES.

too, of the Republican party, it is that.

QUESTIONS OF INTEREST IN THE CAMPAIGN.

Strong Letter Addressed to Chairman Manley on the Political Questions of the Day - The History of Reciprocity-Democracy and the Currency.

AUGUSTA, Me., Sept. 6.—James G. Blaine has addressed the following letter to Chairman Manley, of the Republican

National Committee: BAR HARBOR, Me., Sept. 3 .- The Hon. Joseph H. Manley, Chairman, Etc., Augusta, Me. - My Dean Sir: Not being able. for the reasons which I have explained to you, to deliver public speeches in this present campaign, I take the liberty of submitting my views on the issues which I re-gard as being strongest for the Republicans to urge before the people. The issue of the greatest consequence is the tariff on imports, and it will continue to be until a settlement is effected by a majority so large that it will be tantamount to general acquiesence. The Republicans are ag-gressive on this subject. Two years ago they passed a general enactment known as the Mckinley tariff, which for a time failed to meet with popular approval, and was regarded with a certain degree of distrust by those who had always upheld the protective system. But a powerful reaction has come in consequence of the vindi-cation of the Mckinley tariff by exper-ience. It is found to have worked admirably, and within the last year has produced a greater volume of business, internal and external, export and import, than the States ever transacted United Notwithstanding the character and extent of the opposition to it, agriculture is remunerative, manufactures are prosperous and commerce is more flourishing than at any previous time—thus vindicating the McKinley tariff by an impressive and un-deniable series of facts. Against this tariff the Democratic party have taken a position almost without parallel in the history of the country. They reject entirely the doctrine of protection, pronounce it a fraud and anathematize it generally. A resolution to this effect was adopted by the Democratic convention against the report of the committee on resolutions by a twothirds vote, thus manifesting the intelli-gent participation of every man in the convention. Sometimes a resolution may be adopted in haste, or just when the convention is adjourning it may fail to receive the attention of the members, but this resolution was debated, pro and con, adopted aft r a contest, and was perfectly under-stood by the members of the convention. It is contained in these words: "We denounce the Republican protection

as a fraud upon the labor of the great majority of the American people for the bene-lit of a tew. We declare it a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the tederal government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only. We demand that the collection of such taxes be limited to the necessities of the the government when honestly and economically administered.

If anyone will take the trouble to read the resolutions by which Mr. Calhoun sought to defend his nullification scheme in 1833 he will find the tariff platform of the Democratic party in general harmony

emplated in the Democratic resolution

The Democrats are in the habit of naming Jefferson as the founder of their party, and yet, on the subject of tariff, they are in radical opposition to the principles laid down by Jefferson. Towards the close of his administration the revenue from the tariff on imports produced a considerable surplus, and the opestion was what should surplus, and the question was what should be done. Should the tariff be reduced or should this surplus be maintained? Jefferson pointedly asked: "Shall we sup press the imports and give that advantage to foreign over comestic manufactures? For himself he recommended that "the imports be maintained," and that the surplus created "snould be appropriated to the improvement of roads, canals, rivers and education.

It the constitution did not give sufficient power to warrant these appropriations Jefferson went so far as to recommend that it be amended. This presents the strongest condition of affairs upon which a protective tariff can be justified, and Jefferson did not hesitate to recommend it. The Democrats of the present day, it is needless to say, are in direct opposition to the policy which Jefferson thus outlined and adhered to.

EXPLAINS THE RECIPROCITY SCHEME. When the principle of reciprocal trade was first proposed to be introduced into the tariff system, the Democrats showed a most generous appreciation of the ques-tion, and gave it their support as long as Republicans refused to accept it, but when Republicans came to approve of it the Democratic support vanished, and instead of favoring, we find the Democratic national convention passing a resolution hostile to the system. But in spite of Demo-cratic opposition we have attained, through reciprocity, a new and valuable trade, and the system has demonstrated its many advantages. We were about to declare sugar, molasses, coftee and hides free from all duties in the McKmley bill, but instead of that we passed a law by which we asked the several nations interested what they would give to have those articles made free. We found that the privileges which we were about to give, without cost and without charge, would secure a large trade in Brazil, in Cuba, and Porto Rico, in the Windward and the Leeward Islands, in British Guayana and Jamaica, San Domingo, and the five Central American states, and to a minor degree in Austria, France, and Germany—all in exchange for the articles which we had intended to

The free list of the McKinley tariff is larger in the number of articles, and in the aggregate amount of their import value, than the dutiable list. What would have been the result to the United States if every article, before it was put on the tree list, nad been made the subject of inquiry to see what we could get in exchange for We omitted to do so for many years and that neglect has cost the government advantages in trade which would hav amounted to tens of millions of dollars This is the whole of the reciprocity scheme. It is very plain and very simple. It secures a valuable trade in exchange for articles otherwise destined to be put on the free list. The Democratic party think they can discredit it, and they make the effort apparently for the unpatriotic rea-son that they did not originate it.

WHAT STATE BANKS MEAN. With all its calamities the war brought as one great blessing-national currency. There are many who will say that it was worth the cost of the war to bring about so auspicious a result to capital and labor. Prior to the war we had the worst currency system of any enlightened nation What is in the world. The state banks, with some exceptions, were thoroughly irresponsible. They existed by thousands throughout the Whenever one of them United States. weapons by which the battle is to be failed the result was a large loss and great distress among the people. No one was responsible for their bills, and they were generally found scattered in the pockets of total loss without any redemption what-ever. Or the state banks it was often and truly said that their debts were the measure of their profits. They have caused an per dollar that circulates among the people

has the United States behind it as guarantee. All the banks that exist are under the control of the national government, and if they fail as financial institutions the government has taken care that their bills shall be paid by securities deposited in government vaults.

Under these circumstances it is a matter for extraordinary surprise that the Demo-cratic conventions should deliberately pass resolutions for the revival of state banks. The palpable effect of this policy, if carried out, would be to cheat the poor man out of his daily bread. If state banks be adopted and their circulation attain a large issue, no device could be more deadly for the deception and despoilment of all the commercial and laboring classes. How the Democratic convention came to make such a declaration, who was its author, what intelligent purpose was in it, will remain a mystery. I have heard the argument adduced that we would keep our money at home if state banks were instituted, but we should keep it at home be-cause it would be so worthless that nobody would take it abroad. Were the system of state banks revived, we would again have discounts at the state lines, large charges for drafts on financial centers, and general suspicion of every bill offered in payment, with a liquidation every few years that would be destructive loss to the innocent holders of bills, and a corresponding pront to the parties owning the banks.

The three issues which I have given are the issues on which I would arraign the Democratic party. I would not multiply issues nor be diverted by our opponent from a steadlast adherence to and conpresentation of these questions be stant fore the people, until every voter is made to know and understand their true and weighty significance.

Very sincerely yours, JAMES G. BLAINE.

Effect of Free Wool on Farmers. In 1891 there were 43,413,136 sheep of th value of \$108,394,447, which yielded 285, 000,000 pounds of wool. On the above number 18,575,400 were east of the Missis sippi and Missouri rivers, and most of them were kept on lands like those described by Judge Lawrence, upon which no other stock could be kept at any profit

whatever. Now, we have seen that the farmer' business is one of narrow margins and small profits, and legislative bodies should hesitate long before they do anything to lessen his chances or limit his facilities for making the most out of every one of his small opportunities.

But we shall certainly be so limiting him if we make one lota less profitable the keeping of sheep, and no one will deny but that this bill will surely have that erfect. Besides depriving him of the profit-able use of hundreds of millions of acres of land practically valueless for any other purpose, it would, the moment the bill had the executive approval—which, by the way, will never happen while Benjamin Harrison is president—take ten or twelve cents per pound off every pound of wool in the country.—Speech of W. W. Grant, of Vt., in H. R., March 31, 1892.

### Can We Make Tin Plate?

Can we make tin plate in this country The gentleman who opened the discussion yesterday (Mr. Shively) said undoubtedly we could. I was gratified to hear his statement, for I had read in Democratic papers so long that it could not be made in therewith: and if he examines the subject further he will discover that the duties in the compromise tariff which reconciled Mr. Calhoun and appeased his angry fol-

the house; and when he recognized use single moment the power of the American mechanic, the power of the American people, to make that or any other thing that was to be made on earth, I felt like applauding. I felt like being grateful; applauding. In gratitude now. Unforand I express my gratitude now. Unfor-unately, Mr. Chairman, his whole argu-ment subsequent to that declaration was adverse to that statement. Unfortunately, he spent his two hours to show that there bad been a failure in making tin plate in this country; and in the haste of argument and in the eagerness of advocacy I fear that he was not always careful, to remen

ber facts as they were.
- It has been a long time since this industry had an opportunity of being natural ized and acclimated in this country. It was but a little while ago that the tariff law of 1850 became applicable to this industry. All over the country efforts are being made to pursue and develop it; all over the country money is being invested in it; and because to-day it has not taken the place of England and Wales it has been belittled in this house hour after hour, and to my other surprise, and my surprise is so great that I have not found a reason for it yet. Every word that was suggested by that orator that belittled American ability, American enterprise and American success was loudly applauded on that side of the chamber.—Ibia.

#### Repeal Duty on Wool, and Sheep-Raising Industry is Destroyed.

If you repeal this duty and the sheep-raising industry of this country is de-stroyed, then the million of men who are to-day engaged, in part or in whole,in that industry will be driven out of employment, and where are they to go? Are they go-ing into idleness? Are they not rather going to enter other occupations, and may they not invade the occupations of the con-stituents of my friend from Missouri, oc-cupations which to-day are more than full? Why, sir, the constituents of the gentle-man from Missouri, and other men of the same class elsewhere, have had their repre-sentatives in every congress in which I have been a member, complaining of the want of labor and of opportunities to earn a living; and yet my friend from Missourt stands up here and seriously inverghs against the duty on wool, which protects the wool-grower of this country, and seri-ously proposes to turn out the million of men engaged in wool-growing to invade the occupations of his own constituents and others elsewhere.—Speech of Hon. S. L. Milliken, of Me., in H. R., April 4.

#### Ability to Manufacture Tin.

I affirm three things with respect to the tin-plate industry: First, that American capital has already responded to the invitation extended to it by the Mckinley law, and has practically demonstrated our ability to manufacture our own supply; second, that the result has been to reduce the price of the foreign product, and will be to reduce the price of the home product; and, third, that the effect of this new industry will be to make us independent of foreigners, while it will add millions of money to the channels of our home trade, to the benefit of the American people.—Speech of Hon. John Dalzell, of Pa., in H. R.,

Strikes No Connection With Tariff. A few days ago the pro tempore leader of the house on that side, with a disin-genuousness unwortny of him, inveighed against the protective system because certain coal-miners in Alabama, cer-tain iron-workers in Pennsylvania, had struck for higher wages. He knows that the tariff had no connection with these strikes. He knows that in all climes, at all times, since man first looked into the eye of his fellow, capital and la gaged in contests which a Christian civifization has lessened in number and reduced in bitterness, but has not yet lcarned to prevent. He known that not long since the streets of free-trade London resounded the laboring man, to whom they were a to the tramp of marching thousands, strikers, not for an advance, but against a reduction of wages. Men, and women, too, who in Trafaigar Square, in presence of the bronze figure of England's great capaggregate loss of hundreds of millions of dollars among the poor. Since the close denounced the policy that on land made of the war all this is different. Every paper dollar that circulates among the poor the beggars of her own. He knows that today four hundred thousand mine-workers in free-trade England, out on a strike, have laid their paralyzing hand on England's trade.

> And if the gentleman from Tennessee, appealing in an assembly such as this, not to reason, but to passion and prejudice, is enamoured of this subject of strikes, let me commend him to the recent history of his own state. where freemen-mme-workers-were turned out to the winter's blast, hungry and workless, by convicts put in their places to sate the greed of Democratic mine-owners. That strike, like all the others, bore no relation to the tariff, nor did the tariff bear any relation to it. Man's avarice on one side or on the other accounts for them all, tariff or no tariff.—Speech of Hon. John Datzel, of Pa., in H. R., April 2, 1892.

Mr. Blaine in the Field.

The appearance of Mr. Blaine's letter is a most significent political event. Its strength is twofold. Its statements and arguments will take tast hold of the minds of the country, and it will furnish indisputable proof that Republicans are thoroughly united for the national campaign. Mr. Platt's interview shows that the New York leaders are in line to assure victory in that state. Mr. Blaine's proclamationtor such it really is—has a wider range, since few Americans, if any, have ever had a more numerous personal following.

Like everything which he writes, the paper is clear and strong. Every voter who can read or to whom it is read can under-

stand it. In this respect, both the of President Harrison and that of Mr. Blame are models and marvels. Mr. Blaine's explanation of reciprocity will aid many speakers in presenting it to voters. It is not confused or wrapped around with the theories of free trade which Democratic workers hold up to their mystified and uncomprehending audiences. His statement of results is equally clear. It has increased our national business to a point never before reached in our

history.

It will be interesting to see the Democratic speakers wrestle with the point he establishes that their modern party has deserted Jefferson and repudiated his tariff positions. In short, it will be inter-esting to observe the process by which they will attempt to meet this formidable arraignment. It is a document which will do yeomen service throughout the campaign.

#### What the Democratic Foreign Policy Did Not Do.

The Democratic platform declares that it is the only party that has given the country a vigorous foreign policy. Well, its vigorous foreign policy did not remove the invidious and untriendly discrimination against us by a large number of European countries, which positively pro-hibited the importation of our pork on the untruthful pretext that it was dangerous

The foreign policy of the present Republican administration did, and in space of high duties and all the difficulties attending the sudden revival of a long-pro-hib cd trade in an officially slandered article, which the people had been taught to believe dangerous, in the few months to believe dangerous, in the few months that have eiapsed this new market for the Western farmers had amounted to over \$2.000,000 up to June 30 last. Perhaps that is why the Democratic convention amiabily remarked in its platform that the Republican policy—that policy under which the country has grown steadily greater and more prosperous for thirty years—fosters no industry so much as that of the sherif,—Whitelaw Reid.